

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

FIRST APPEAL No 2495 of 1999

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE M.H.KADRI  
and  
Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE C.K.BUCH

- =====
1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO
  2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO
  3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO
  4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO
  5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

-----  
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER

Versus

KALIBA WD/O BHAIKAVSINH MANSINH

-----  
Appearance:

MR MUKESH R SHAH for Appellant  
MR KM SHETH for Respondent No. 1  
MR KG SHETH for Respondents No.2 and 3  
-----

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE M.H.KADRI  
and  
MR.JUSTICE C.K.BUCH

Date of decision: 14/03/2000

ORAL JUDGEMENT {Per: Kadri, J.}

1. The appellant by filing this appeal under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter

referred to be as 'the Act') read with Section 96 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, has challenged the judgment and award dated November 16, 1998, passed by the learned Second Extra Assistant Judge, Panchmahals at Godhra, in Land Acquisition Reference No.369 of 1993, by which the Reference Court determined the market value of the acquired lands of the respondents-claimants situated at village Katwara, Tal. Dahod, District Panchmahals, at Rs.16.02 paise per sq.mt. alongwith solatium and additional amount under Section 23(1-A) of the Act.

2. A proposal was made by the Executive Engineer, Small Irrigation Division, District Panchayat, Godhra, District Panchmahals, to the State Government for acquisition of the agricultural lands situated at village Katwara for the public purpose of 'Kaluba Anushravan Pond Water Tank Project'. The said proposal was scrutinised by the Government and notification to acquire lands of the claimant-respondent came to be issued under Section 4(1) of the Act, which came to be published in the Government Gazette on July 13, 1992. After following the usual procedure under the Act, declaration under Section 6 of the Act was made, and which was published in the Government Gazette on February 18, 1993. The land owners were served with notices under Section 9(3)(4) of the Act. The claimant appeared before the Land Acquisition Officer and claimed compensation of the acquired lands at the rate of Rs.20.00/- per sq.mt., but, having regard to the materials placed before him, the Land Acquisition Officer made his award on October 8, 1993, and offered compensation to the claimant at the rate of Rs.1.30/per sq.mt. for the acquired lands of the respondent-claimant situated at village Katwara. The claimants were of the opinion that the compensation offered by the Land Acquisition Officer was inadequate. Therefore, the claimant submitted application under Section 18 of the Act requiring the Land Acquisition Officer to refer application to the Court for determination of adequate compensation. Accordingly, reference was made to the District Court, Panchmahals, which came to be numbered as Land Acquisition Reference No.369 of 1993.

3. The appellant and the State of Gujarat had filed their reply inter-alia contending that the market value offered by the Land Acquisition Officer was just and adequate. That the Land Acquisition Officer taking into consideration the fertility and situation of the acquired lands had offered compensation as per the prevailing market value of the acquired lands and hence, the appellant and the State of Gujarat prayed that the reference application be dismissed. The Reference Court,

on the basis of the rival pleadings of the parties, framed issues at Exh.8.

4. Before the Reference Court also, the claimant claimed compensation at the rate of Rs.20.00/- per sq.mt. To substantiate their claim of compensation of acquired lands, the claimant examined Power of Attorney Holder Mr.Surendrasinh B.Thakor at Exh.16 and one Mr.Amarsinh Madhubhai Kathaliya at Exh.17. The claimant also produced documentary evidence such as deed power of attorney executed by claimant-Kaliba at Exh.11 and sale deed of revenue survey No.363/1 at Exh.15. The appellant did not lead oral or documentary evidence. The Reference Court, for determination of market value of the acquired lands, relied on sale deed at Exh.15 of revenue Survey No.363/1 which had taken place on November 11, 1986, between Amarsinh and Agriculture Produce Market Committee, Dahod. The area of the lands under Sale Deed Exh.15 was 9308 sq.mt. The sale price of sale deed Exh.15 comes to Rs.10.15p/- per sq.mt. in 1986. Surprisingly the Reference Court, without there being any sale deed in respect of revenue Survey No.362 of same village, taking into consideration the sale price of said survey number held that revenue survey no.362 of village Katwara was sold at the rate of Rs.20.03p/- per sq.mt. in the year 1986. It is settled legal principle that, unless vendor and vendee is examined and unless sale deed is produced in the court, no reliance can be placed on such unproved sale instance (see the case of Special Deputy Collector and another Vs. Kurra Sambasiva Rao and others reported in AIR 1997 Supreme Court page 2625). Therefore, for determining the market value of the acquired lands, sale of revenue survey no.362 shall have to be ignored because no sale deed was produced before the court and neither the vendor nor vendee were examined by the claimants.

Sale Deed at Exh.15 was duly proved through the evidence of witness Amarsinh M.Kathaliya Exh.17. Sale of survey no.363/1 which had taken place on November 11, 1986, i.e. prior to six years of the issuance of the notification under Section 4(1) of the Act. The price of the lands under sale deed Exh.15 was at Rs.10.15p/- per sq.mt. in 1986. It is settled legal principle that prices of lands increases day by day, and the Court can take judicial notice of it. This Court in the reported decision 1998(1) GLR page 130 had given rise of price at 10% p.a. Admittedly, there was a gap of six years between execution of sale deed Exh.15 and issuance of notification of the present acquired lands under Section 4(1) of the Act. If rise in price at the rate of 10%

p.a. for six years is given to the sale price of sale deed Exh.15, then the price would come to Rs.16.25p/per sq.mt. as on July 1992. As per the decision of the Supreme Court reported in AIR 1997 Supreme Court page 1791 in the case of Shimla Development Authority and others Vs. Smt. Santosh Sharma and another, when sale instance of non-agricultural lands is relied on for determination of market value of agricultural lands, 40% should be deducted towards development and other charges. If the deduction is given at 40% to the market price of non-agricultural lands which was approximately Rs.16.25p/- per sq.mt. the net market value of the agricultural lands in the year 1992 would come to Rs.10.50p/- per sq.mt. The claimants would also be entitled to the statutory benefits under Section 23(1-A) and 23(2) and interest under Section 28 of the Act.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent No.1-original claimant has vehemently submitted that, the appeal be remanded to the reference Court so that the claimant can lead evidence in support of their claim for enhanced compensation of the acquired lands at the rate of Rs.20.00/- per sq.mt. The submission made by learned counsel for the claimant deserves to be rejected. The claimant had sufficient opportunity to lead evidence in support of their claim before the reference Court. On the contrary, they had produced and proved sale deed Exh.15 in respect of lands of survey No.363/1, which was in respect of sale of non-agricultural lands. If the claimant had not availed of the opportunity to lead evidence in support of their claim of enhanced compensation, they cannot make grievance that they had no sufficient opportunity of leading evidence before the reference court. The claimant cannot be permitted to fill up the lacuna by remand of the appeal. In the instant case, considering the facts of the case, the market value determined at Rs.10.50p/per sq.mt. is, in our opinion, just and adequate compensation to be awarded to the claimants keeping in mind the fertility and the situation of the acquired lands.

6. In the decision of Meharban and others vs. State of U.P. and others reported in AIR 1997 Supreme Court page 2664, the Supreme Court has ruled that, even if no witness corrected with three sale deeds was examined, the said evidence which was inadmissible, even then it is the duty of the Court to take all the relevant factors into consideration and determine compensation instead of remitting the matter to reference Court by prolonging the agony of the parties. In view of the above decision of the Supreme Court and the settled legal principle, we are

of the opinion that, when there is evidence available for determination of market value of the present acquired lands, appeal cannot be remitted to the reference Court for redetermination of the market value of the acquired lands.

7. For the foregoing reasons, this appeal is partly allowed. The market value of the acquired lands of village Katwara is determined at Rs.10.50p/- per sq.mt. as on July 30, 1992. The claimants would also be entitled to statutory benefits under Section 23(1-A), 23(2) and interest under Section 28 as per the amended Act. The award of the Reference Court be modified accordingly. There shall be no order as to costs. Office is directed to draw the decree in terms of this judgment.

\*\*\*\*\*

syed/